

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 11-19 are pending in this application. The Office Action withdraws claims 1-6, 11-16 and 18-19 as drawn to non-elected species; rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph; rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b); and rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By this Amendment, claim 7 is amended to incorporate the features of claims 8-10; claims 8-10 are cancelled; claims 11-12, 15 and 17 are amended; and the specification is amended. No new matter is added.

**I. Restriction/Election**

Applicants affirm the election with traverse of group II, species 2b. Applicants maintain that upon the allowance of independent linking claim 7, all claims dependant therefrom must be allowed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. By this Amendment, claim 17 is amended to recite that the turret holds a polishing body-holding unit for holding a polishing a body by a magnetic force. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim scope is in accordance with the present specification at, for example, page 17, lines 18+.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,312,320). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claim 7 is amended to further recite that the optical disk restoration apparatus comprises a rotating controller for regulating the rotation of the object to be polished

(per original claim 9); and a linking part connecting the rotation controller and the object holder inserted through a cavity of a shaft of the turret (per original claim 10).

Applicants respectfully submit that Sato cannot anticipate claim 7 because Sato at least does not disclose a rotating controller for regulating the rotation of the object to be polished. Instead, Sato discloses only a disk cleaning device wherein the object to be cleaned *does not rotate* except as a result of frictional forces between the object and a polishing member (column 3, lines 1-8). Therefore, Sato does not disclose any component that is capable of regulating the rotation of the object to be polished, as the presently claimed invention requires. Furthermore, as Sato discloses no such rotating controller, Sato also does not disclose any linking part connecting a rotating controller and the object holder, as is presently claimed. Therefore, claim 7 is not anticipated by Sato.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Sato in view of Senga et al. (U.S. Patent 6,520,895). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Sato is discussed above with respect to claim 7, from which claim 17 depends.

Senga is cited solely for its disclosure of the use of magnets to provide a connection between two bodies in a polishing device (column 4, lines 55+).

Applicants respectfully submit that Senga does not cure the deficiencies of Sato as discussed above. Specifically, Senga also does not disclose, nor does Senga teach or suggest, a rotating controller for regulating the rotation of the object to be polished and a linking part connecting the rotation controller and the object holder inserted through a cavity of a shaft of the turret. Specifically, in Senga the object to be polished does not rotate, instead it is held by a "object retention mechanism" (column 3, line 47; see Fig. 2). Therefore, Senga does not disclose a rotating controller for regulating the rotation of the object to be polished.

Therefore, because Sato and Senga do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 17, claim 17 is patentable over the applied references.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Samuel T. Dangremond  
Registration No. 60,466

JAO:STD/std

Date: January 22, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--